IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(*Special Original Jurisdiction*)

TUESDAY, THE FIFTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

P R E S E N T

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ELIPE DHARMA RAO

* * *

WRIT PETITION NO : 14337 of 2005

Between:

Male Pedda Lalappa, S/o. Bhupaiah,
R/o. Dgnapuram Village, Maduru Mandalam, Mahaboobnagar, Presently R/o. Flat No. 101, Vishnu Residency, Gandhinagar, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

A N D

1 The District Collector, Mahaboobnagar District, Mahaboobnagar.
2 Cholamandalam Investment & Finance Company Ltd., 6-3-1093,

Rajbhavan Road, Hyderabad, S/o. Dayanad Gatla, aged 35 yrs, Occ:

Deputy Manager, (Legal) R/o. Hyderabad.
3 Cholamandalam Investment & Finance Company Ltd.,

Mahaboobnagar, Rep. by its Branch Manager,
Mahaboobnagar District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ order or direction particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the respondent No.1 in not disposing off the representation dt. 9-6-2005 filed by the petitioner as illegal, arbitrary and consequently direct the respondents to return the Tractor Bearing No. A.P. 22-U 5236 (New Hallen Made Model No. 3230) by issuing a writ of Mandamus or any appropriate writ order or direction, and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit

and proper in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.A.K.NARASIMHA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following at the admission stage **:** (Order follows 2nd page)

O R D E R

This writ petition is filed to declare the inaction of the first respondent in not disposing off the representation dated 09-6-2005 filed by the petitioner as illegal, arbitrary and consequently direct the respondents to return the tractor bearing Regdn.No.AP-22U-5236 (New Hallen Made Model No.3230) by issuing a writ of mandamus.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Govt.Pleader for respondents.

After hearing both sides, I am not able to appreciate the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, as there is no provision of law to entertain this writ petition.

Moreover, the transaction between the petitioner and the second respondent is purely a private transaction of obtaining loan for purchase of the vehicle in

question. Therefore, I see no reason to entertain the present writ petition. The writ petition fails and is liable to be dismissed inlimini.

In the result, the writ petition is dismissed at the admission stage. No costs.

JULY 7th, 2005. ---------- I S L. ELIPE DHARMA RAO, J

To

1 The District Collector, Mahaboobnagar District, Mahaboobnagar.
2 Two CCs to Govt.Pleader for Revenue, High Court Buildings,

Hyderabad.

3 One CC to Mr.A.K.Narasimha Rao, Counsel for the Petitioner.

4 2 CD copies.